CHAPTER VI

THE CONCEPT OF MAN IN THE NT

The Bible as a whole, and the NT in particular, could be described as a Sacred Book which gives an account of God-man dialogue from the beginning of history. The dialogue, of course, has to be understood within the much narrower world-view (both geographically and historically) than the one which the modern man has. Having considered the nature of God and of the world in the NT it is of special interest to us to deal with the NT concept of man. Indeed, a clear NT concept of man is vital for us to describe the nature of incarnation.

In the first part, the ontological constitution of the Biblical man will be described. This will give a definite point of reference to pin-point as to what is meant by the particular behaviour or attitude of man, especially when referred to the Hebrew idioms. In the second part, the creatureliness of man will be highlighted without going into details as it has been already treated in other context. Being a crucial concept to understand the NT man, it has to be brought out once again. In the third part it will be shown that the chief reason for giving such supreme importance to man in the Bible, over and above all the other creatures, is the belief that man has been created in the image of God. In the following two parts the bondage and freedom of will of man will be considered.

A: THE ONTOLOGICAL CONSTITUTION OF MAN

It has been pointed out how inadequate it is to translate atman and anātman into body and soul. But it is far more inaccurate to
consider the Biblical man in such dualistic terms. It is often said that if the Hellenistic man is an incarnated spirit, the Biblical man is an animated flesh. The Biblical scholars as a whole do not get tired of emphasizing this difference, chiefly as a correct reaction against the traditional tendency of platonizing the Biblical man. As any reaction, here too there is some exaggeration.

The apprehension of some sort of dualism in man does not need much philosophy or science. The ancient man could easily distinguish the living man from the dead body. It is certainly not true to say that for the Biblical man a dead body is just dust and nothing more than that. Otherwise we can't account for the respect paid to the dead-body, or for the belief in the 'existence' of the dead in Sheol (Pss. 6:5;36:10;53:11; Is 38:11,18). In psalms 49 and 73 there are traces of belief in immortality. "But God will redeem my life from the grasp of Sheol, and will receive me" (Ps.49:13). Here the death of the righteous and the wicked are compared, and a fairer deal is expected for the righteous. McKenzie writes: "In this context when the psalmist expresses his faith that Yahweh will deliver him from death, the deliverance can scarcely mean preservation from some particular danger; it must be a preservation that will distinguish the righteous from the wicked." In the proverbs we read: "The upward path to life is for the wise man, that he may avoid Sheol below" (15:24; Cf. also 12.28). It is unrealistic to imagine that the Hebrew thinking was not influenced by the neighbouring Canaanite (Ugaritic) Egyptian and Hellenistic cultures where dualistic thinking was predominant.

Some sort of duality is implied in the creation story itself.
"Ya hweh God fashioned man of dust from the soil. Then he breathed
into his nostrils breath of life, and thus man became a living being (nefesh hayyah)” (Gen 2:7). Here, there is an element of dualism in considering man as a combination of something subtle (nefesh = breath, life) and of something gross (adamah = dust). In the OT there are occasions when nefesh and basar (flesh) are dualistically considered (Dt 12:23; Is 10:18). There is a trace of dualism in Paul when he contrasts the body (soma) and the spirit (pneuma) (1 Cor 5:3; 7:34; 2 Cor 12:2-3). If the OT could be so much influenced by the Hellenistic thinking (Wis 3:1 and 3:19-20) there is nothing to be surprised at the same influence on Paul who was born in a Hellenistic milieu.

The above remarks are only by way of caution lest we may make the Hebrew thinking and culture as something preserved in a cold storage. We do agree with the scriptural scholars that the Hebrew concept of man is very different from that of Indian or Greek. Indeed, the consideration of man in terms of atman-anatman even in generalistic terms would be misleading. Hence our approach to the Biblical man has to be quite different. Since the "psychic activity is usually associated in the Bible with various organs of the body" we shall try to describe briefly some of the components that constitute the Biblical man, in so far as they highlight certain aspects of the human personality.

1. Nefesh

Though this term is translated into Greek as psyche and into English as soul, it is considered as inaccurate even by the translators themselves. After analysing various instances where this work occurs McKenzie writes: "The key word in these analysis is totality in the sense that it is not 'man has nefesh but man is nefesh' " Hence Patrapankal is right in saying that the flesh with which nefesh is often contrasted is
the outward and visible manifestation of nefesh. In a number of instances nefesh and basar are used to express totality (Jb 14:22; Is 10:18). Nefesh is used for animals too (Gn 1:20;1:30;2:19;12:13 etc.) though both the OT and the NT consider man as radically different from the animals. After considering a number of instances where this concept occurs, one is tempted to identify it with the Sanskrit prān; but nefesh cannot be considered as the principle of life since it is nefesh that lives. Besides nefesh itself dies (Nm 23:10; Ez 16:4).

The following summary description of nefesh by McKenzie brings out some of the important elements of this concept:

The basic meaning can be understood, it seems, in those uses where nefesh is translated by self or person, but it is the concrete existing self. It is the self precisely as personal, as the conscious subject of action and passion, as distinct from other selves... Consciousness is life, the manifestation of the nefesh.

The NT psyche (soul) has much more common with the Hebrew nefesh than with the Greek psyche or Sanskrit atman though the LXX translated nefesh into psyche. In the NT psyche is said to be sustained by food (Mt 6:25; Lk 12:22) unlike the English idiom of 'keeping the body and the soul together'. Psyche is the seat of passions like desire (Lk:12:19) and sorrow (Mt 26:38; Nk 14:34). The psyche pierced as by a sword (Lk 2:35). The psyche of 1 Cor 15:45 is very much the nefesh of the CT. It denotes man with his vitality, consciousness and volition (1Thes 2:8; Phil 2:30; 2 Cor 1:23). And very often psyche in the NT signifies person (Nk 3:4; Lk 6:9; Rom 2:9).

2. Flesh

Though basar and nefesh together express the totality of man in Hebrew as the body and soul do in English, the analogy is very misleading.
In the NT "sarx" is translated as flesh (σαρξ in Greek) though the former expresses both the body and the flesh. The expression "all flesh" signifies all living beings (Gen 6:17; 7:21; Job 34:15) and also all animals (Gen 7:15; 8:17). "Flesh and blood" denotes the total man (Mt 16:17; Gal 1:16; 1 Cor 15:50). In the NT sarx (flesh) has a pejorative sense signifying man in so far as fragile, weak and corruptible.

3. Body

Soma (body) and pneuma (spirit) are a pair often used in the NT more under the Greek influence than the Hebrew. For Hebrew has no word for body except that it denotes a corpse. In the NT this concept is used in parallel with life (Mt 6:25; Lk 12:22). It is more in the Greek sense that Jesus says not to be afraid of those who can kill the body (soma) but not the soul ( psyche ) (Mt 10:28). For Paul often the visible biological parts stand for soma (Rom 12:4-8; 1 Cor 12:12-26). Often he uses this concept in the sense of 'self' as when he says: "I shall have the courage for Christ to be glorified in my soma" (Phil 1:20, cf. Rom 6:12-13).

Usually Paul prefers to use sarx rather than soma in a pejorative sense; but sometimes he does use pejoratively. Fitzmayer writes: "When Paul uses soma in a pejorative sense, when speaking of the 'desires or passions' of the body (Rom 6:12; 8:13), of the 'body of sin' (Rom 6:6) of the 'body of humiliation' (Phil 3:21) or of the 'body of death' (Rom 8:3) he really means man under the sway of some power like Sin or the 'flesh' (Rom 7:4; 18:23; 8:3, 13)." XLD stresses the special dignity Paul gives to this concept. "Not only does body give unity to a totality of parts but it symbolizes the person in his most significant phases: his native state as a sinner, his consecration to Christ, his life of glory."
4. **Spirit**

Hebrew ruah is translated as pneuma in Greek, and as spirit in English. Pneuma in its primary sense means wind or breath like the Sanskrit man. But when it is used in connection with God in the OT it stands for a dynamic, divine entity by which Yahweh accomplishes his designs reminding us of the atmaa of BG. 4:6. The phrase "in the spirit" often implies inwardness (Mt 2:8; Jn 12). But our primary interest in this concept is not when it refers to Yahweh's power or when it expresses the second person of the Trinity, but to something that constitutes the human personality. This is chiefly found in St. Paul. What does he mean when he lines up what seems to be three constituents of man, viz. spirit (pneuma), soul (psyche) and body (soma) (1 Thes 5:23)? He says: "May you all be kept safe and blameless, spirit, soul and body, for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Fitzmyer writes: "Joined to soma and psyche, which denote the whole man under different aspects, pneuma would seem to be another aspect... If anything, pneuma suggests the knowing and willing self of man and as such reveals him to be particularly apt to receive the Spirit of God." It is in this sense we have to interpret what Paul speaks of the Divine Spirit and "our own spirit" (pneumati eumven) bearing a united witness to man's divine filiation (Rom 8:16).

5. **Heart**

Though the ancients were not aware of the exact functions of the heart with regard to the circulatory system, they did notice its connection with man's emotional activity. It is the heart that experiences joy (Jgs 18:20; Jn 16:22) or sorrow (Ps 13:3; Jn 14:1; 15:6). Christ says: "... a man's words flow out of what fills his heart" (Mt 12:34). There are a number of instances where the heart is understood as a seat of
intelligence (Mk 7:21; 11:23; Jn 12:40; AA 7:23). This is how XLD describes the functions of the heart according to the Bible:

The Hebrew frequently uses heart where we would say memory, mind or awareness. Greatness of heart (1 K 5:9) indicates a large amount of knowledge. ... According to different contexts, the meaning can be solely intellectual (Mk 8:17) or can extend beyond the intellect (AA 7:51). The heart of man, therefore, is his whole conscious, intelligent and free personality.  

6. Blood

This is another constituent of the human structure which can give us some other aspects of the human personality in the Bible. Without understanding the real meaning of 'blood' in the Hebrew context we can hardly find out the meaning of the OT sacrificial religion or of Christ's sacrificial death. It is not difficult to see why the Bible associates or even identifies life with blood. When the blood fully goes out of a wounded man, he dies, and the dead body usually does not emit blood. We read in the Leviticus: "The life of the flesh is in the blood. This blood I myself have given you to perform the rite of atonement for your lives at the altar" (Lv 17:11,14; cfr Gn 9:4; Dt 12:23). If blood were not shed in killing (Gn 37:22) or if it were not permitted to run upon ground (Jgs 9:5) it could be thought that blood-guilt would not follow. Because of this special meaning attached to blood there was strict dietary prohibition against blood (Gn 9:4; Lv 17:10 ff). For, as life, so too blood belongs to God and its proper place is in sacrifice (Lv 3:17). When Christ told his disciples to drink his blood symbolized by the wine, he meant that they would share the Divine Life which he came to communicate (Mt 26:27).

The above analysis of the ontological structure of man considered
in himself brings home to us that the Biblical concept of man's structure is quite different from that of the Indian or Western. The \textit{ātmān-ātman} dualism is far less in the Bible than in the other two traditions though we cannot deny the awareness of some sort of duality between \textit{nefēsh} and \textit{basar}, and \textit{soma} and \textit{pneuma}. True, the seats of the faculties of cognition, conation and affectivity are understood differently from the modern concepts, in the Bible; all the same, the Bible is well aware of these faculties in man.

\textbf{B: MAN AS A CREATURE OF GOD}

What has been said about God's total casuality and the corresponding total dependence of man on God is sufficient for us to understand the meaning of man's creaturly status. Since this concept is very fundamental to the Biblical concept of man a few remarks in this context to highlight its importance are in order. According to the creation myth in the Bible man who was just dust(\textit{ādāma}) became a living being(\textit{nefēsh hayyah}) only when God breathed his breath of life(\textit{nīṣīm hayyah})(Gen 2:7).

"You turn your face away, they suffer, you stop their breath, they die and revert to dust"(Ps. 104:30). If God's breath is withdrawn man will return to dust, nay into nothingness.

The NT carries on this idea without diluting it but emphasizing more strongly that the OT that this dependence on God is not against man's dignity since God is not a whimsical tyrant but a loving Father. Christ would say that "every hair on man's head has been counted"(Lk 12:6) and that man cannot add "a single cubit to his span of life"(Lk 12:25). Christ brings out this idea picturesquely through the parable of the rich man who was making plans for a life of pleasure after a bumper
harvest. God tells him on the very night: "Fool! This very night the demand will be made for your soul; and this heard of yours, whose will it be then?" (Lk 12:20). It is utter foolishness to live forgetting one's total dependence on God. St. Paul using an example from efficient causality explains this creaturely relation:

But what right have you, a human being, to cross-examine God? The pot has no right to say to the potter: Why did you make me this shape? Surely a potter can do what he likes with the clay? It is surely for him to decide whether he will use a particular lump of clay to make a special pot or an ordinary one? (Rom 9:20-21).

6: MAN IS THE IMAGE OF GOD

Though the Biblical authors insist emphatically time and again the total dependence of man on God, they give to man a dignity for above that of other creatures. This is clear especially in the creation myth of Genesis. God tells Adam and Eve: "Be masters of the fish of the sea, the birds of heaven and all living animals on the earth." (Gen 1:28). To express this dominion of man over other creatures the sacred writer points out how Adam gives names to all other creatures (Gen 2:21). For, according to the Hebrews, control over the name implies control over the reality which has this name. According to the Israelites man is the crown of all creation because only man has been created in the image (selem) of God. "God created man in the image of himself, in the image of God he created him, male and female he created them" (Gen 1:27).

How did the Israelites come to have such a concept about human dignity? Till the end of the second millennium B.C., they were nomadic shepherds, by and large. The similarities between man and animals must have been quite obvious to them. Both of them were made out of Adamah (mud) and both have more or less the same ontological constitution.
consisting of soul, flesh, heart, blood etc. But according to them, only man is the image of God. For them man is only a "little less than God (Elohim)" (Ps 8:5). Mainly two ideas are implied in the concept of man as God's image, namely, man's dominion over other creatures and his filial relationship with God.

1. Dominion over Other Creatures

The concept selom (image) is used to signify the statues of gods in the Bible (2 Kg 11:18; 2 Chr 23:17; Am 5:26). In the Israelite tradition there were strong prohibitions against the worship or even against the making of idols (Ex 20:4-6; Dt 5:8-10). In spite of this, the Israelites do not hesitate to call man, Yahweh's image.

In the Babylonian exile the Israelites must have seen the statues of the king, in different parts of the cities, placed to represent the king. People paid homage to these statues which represented to them visibly the king staying in the far-away capital. As the king's selom (statue) represented him in his absence, so too, man, God's image (selom) represented God, like a trustee, in taking care of God's 'garden' that is the world. We may therefore, rightly assume that man's dominion over the other creatures on the one hand, and his accountability before God in the 'administration' of God's world, on the other, must have been one of the reasons which made them consider man as the image of God.

2. Filial Relationship

For the author of the genesis, the son is the image of the father. "Adam became a father of his son, in his likeness, as his image (selom)" (Gen 5:3). As has been pointed out earlier, in the second account of creation (Gen 2:5-25) God's dealings with Adam is analogous to that of a
father with his son in an agrarian society. He gives some land, with fields, groves etc. to his son after building a house in it. He gives instructions to his son as to how to live with the income from the land. The father does not fully divest himself of his authority over the land given to his son. Such a description in the second account of creation must have been inspired by Israelites' experience of Yahweh's fatherly love for them. In the Exodus, which was written much earlier than Genesis, Yahweh considers Israel as his "first born son" (4:22). The Israelites believed themselves as Yahweh's sons (Dt. 14:1; Is 1:2). Besides, by multiplying himself producing more and more divine images through children as imitates Gods creative activity. Rightly therefore NBD interprets the meaning of the concept of man being the 'solen' of God, as follows: "Man exercises his role as image in two major activities: as image of the divine paternity, he ought to multiply and fill the earth; as image of the divine lordship, he ought to subject the earth to his domination."13

The NT takes up this symbol giving it new depths and significance. According to the Genesis account man disfigures his image by rebelling against Yahweh with the demand for autonomy (Gen 2-3). Man was dis-inherited by Yahweh (3:8-24). In the place of order and harmony there began to reign chaos and dissention. God does not abandon man to his own fate but promises him victory (3:15). Indeed, to express his concern for the fallen man "Yahweh, God made clothes out of skins for the man and his wife" (3:21). According to the NT, if Adam disfigured God's image by his sin, Christ the "second Adam" would re-constitute the image through a new creation (Rom 5:12-21; 1 Cor 15:45-49).
According to the NT Christ is the image par excellance of God (2 Cor 4:4; Col 1:15; Heb 3:2). Indeed, he is the Word of God incarnate (Jn 1:14), the incarnation of the second person of the Trinity. If in the first Adam creation was brought to chaos and disorder, in Christ who is the second Adam, there is a new creation (2 Cor 5:17-18; Rev 21:5). When a man follows Christ in total self-surrender one can progressively grow into the image of Christ (Rom 8:29; 2 Cor 3:18). Thus according to the NT by total surrender to Christ man's distorted image through Adam's sin can be restored by a new creation through the work of the Spirit. By restoring the distorted image by putting on Christ's image man can become truly God's children and co-heirs with Christ (Gal 4:1-7; Rom 8:14-17). Christian spirituality, in a sense, consists in making one grow into the image of Christ through the power of the Spirit, with wholehearted dedication.

D. MAN IN BONDAGE OF SIN

1. Some Provisional Remarks

To avoid the impression of contradiction and also tedious repetitions by way of hyphenated qualifications, some preliminary remarks have to be made before we enter the question of man's bondage and liberation. These remarks are meant as provisional in the sense that they would be treated elaborately later on. The first remark is that, from the point of view of the NT, it is somewhat artificial to consider the question of man's bondage independently of Christ's liberating grace, or rather of God's liberating power through Christ. For, the NT speaks of man's bondage and misery chiefly to highlight Christ's liberating influence. This is especially clear in St. Paul's letter to the Romans from chapter one to
eight. According to Paul, if the enslaving forces in man are very powerful, the liberating power of Christ is even more powerful (Rom 5:20-21).

The second remark is that according to the NT there was not a time in history when man was abandoned in his bondage without God's liberating influence through Christ, though the incarnation took place only just two millennia ago. In other words, God's saving design or liberating power through Christ was operative right from the beginning of history. Indeed, the salvation history is coextensive with profane history.

This position is upheld today by most of the leading Christian thinkers.

A third remark is with regard to the use of the language which seems to go against the above position both in the Bible as well as in the Christian thinking. Here we shall cite a passage from the official prayer of the Catholic Church to explain what we mean:

Father, we acknowledge your greatness: all your actions show your wisdom and love. You formed man in your own likeness and set him over the whole world to serve you, his creator, and to rule over all creatures. Even when he disobeyed you and lost your friendship, you did not abandon him to the power of death, but helped all men to seek and find you. Again and again you offered a covenant to man, and through the prophets taught him to hope for salvation.

Father, you so loved the world that in the fulness of time you sent your only son to be our Saviour. He was conceived through the power of the Holy Spirit, and born of the Virgin Mary, a man like us in all things but sin.

According to this prayer first God created man, and this man sins against God by rebellion. And this sin has been and still is affecting the whole of humanity from one generation after another. When the first man committed sin God promised a Saviour or Liberator whom he would send
at an opportune time in history. To be sure, the Saviour comes at a particular point of history as a consequence of man's sin, as though an afterthought in God's mind when he saw man's sin. And this Saviour is Jesus Christ. Thus in this view, there was a time when man was in favour with God, then a time when he was in bondage to sin, and then a time when man is under the influence of Christ's grace, under the liberating influence of God through Christ. Though this position looks very obvious when we read the Bible as a whole, it is no more held by Christian thinkers due to the deeper insights into the mythical and legendary nature of much of the OT narrations, and with greater insights into the meaning of Christ's function as the Saviour of mankind. This position has been responsible for causing unhealthy dualism and false dilemmas between nature and grace, natural and the supernatural, and the order of creation and the order of second creation. If we are aware of these points our consideration on the bondage of man abstracted from the concomitant grace of liberation can become less artificial.

According to the NT man is in bondage due to sin. Jesus says: "I tell you solemnly, everyone who commits sin is a slave" (Jn 8:34). And Paul would say: "I have been sold as a slave to sin" (Rom. 7:14). How does sin bind? Without getting into the various meanings of the concept sin in the NT, we shall restrict the consideration of it as a bondage in the three following ways: bondage to the devil through sin, bondage to sin itself as a personified interior power and bondage due to the loss of filial relationship with God.

2. Bondage to Satan

Jesus came to liberate the sinners, not the virtuous (Mk 2:17), and
the forgiveness of sins constitutes an important aspect of his mission (Mk 2:5-10). But Jesus inaugurates his mission against sin by confronting satan (Mk 1:12). In this first confrontation the devil promises Christ that he would give Christ the whole world provided that he would worship him (Lk 4:5-8). Indeed, the healing ministry of Christ, besides the healing of the demoniacs, is presented in Mark as a struggle to liberate man from the power of satan (Mk 1:23-27; 5:1-17; 7:25-30). However, it is in St. John, the idea that sin is a bondage to the evil is brought out quite explicitly. For John, the sinner belongs to the devil (1 Jn 3:8 and 12). Satan is the father of the sinners (Jn 8:44; 1 Jn 5:10). This idea of slavery by sin to the force of hatred and untruth, which is the devil, is implied in the description of Adam's sin. Adam follows the wicked counsel of the serpent which is later on considered as satan (Wis 2:24).

3. Bondage to Sin Personified

When St. Paul uses 'He Hamartia' in the singular to signify sin, he does not mean any particular sinful act. "In general, when Paul uses the word hamartia in the singular he means Sin with a capital letter, almost personalized like an evil power, a malignant Ladyship (hamartia is feminine in Greek)." In Romans 5, St. Paul describes the tyrannical entry of Sin with its accomplice, death. Lyonnet vividly describes the meaning of this personified concept of sin in St. Paul, referring to the letter to the Romans:

In these chapters (5 to 8) of Romans, sin is presented as a power which, having entered into this world with Adam's transgression, has spread through the whole of human race (5:12-21) and affects even the material world (6:19-22). This power dwells within man and operates through his flesh (7:18, 25b; 8:4-13) or his mortal body (6:12; 8:13). This power, of course, is not Satan, a hostile
power outside man. Yet since Satan acts through sin, Paul can in Rom 5:12 attribute to personified sin the role which Wisdom assigns to the devil (2:24), and say in Rom 7:11 that 'sin' seduces man, just as the serpent seduced Eve according to Gen 3:15. 19

John too depicts sin as an anti-God power within man, using hamartia in the singular (Jn 1:29). In John hamartia, used in the singular, "designates, rather than a particular sinful deed, a state or even a power which thrusts man, and the world taken as a whole from God." 20 A further nuance in this personified concept of sin can be seen when Paul declares (Rom 8:3) that God condemned "Sin" on the cross just as John sees the "prince of this world", that is Satan, is condemned (16:11) or "cast out" (12:31), when Jesus "is lifted up" on the cross.

4. Bondage by Abandoning the "Father's House"

Another aspect of this bondage could be considered by comparing the feelings of interior freedom and joy a loving son feels in doing some common work his father and those of a slave doing works for his master. This contrast is picturesquely brought out in the well known parable of the Prodigal Son in Lk 15. The son leaves his father's house, destroys all his inheritance and then sells himself as a slave. "...he hired himself out to one of the local inhabitants who put him on his farm to feed the pigs" (Lk 15:16). Here the affectionate father stands for God, son for the sinner and the slave-master for the devil or any other despotic temporary reality to which man surrenders himself as though to God. The attitude of the prodigal son is very similar to that of Adam the first man. God, like a father of an agrarian culture prepares a garden for him with all the facilities. But Adam rebels against God seeking autonomy.
from His listening to the 'devil' in the form of the serpent. In both cases, sin is considered as a rebellion against a God of love which leads man from slavery to other powers.

This idea is brought out well in Mt. 17:24-27 where Christ says that the sons are not bound to pay taxes to their fathers but only those outside the household. Here, the idea of freedom based on love is highlighted implicitly contrasting the sense of bondage implied in following certain legal obligations without love. In Gal 3:21-29, where Paul compares the bondage under legal obligations of a child before the age of maturity and the freedom experienced as a matured son, this idea of interior freedom based on love is well described. In the Jewish milieu of Paul's time children were kept under tutors and preceptors with very little freedom. They were bound by so many 'dose' and 'don'ts'. But when he comes of age he personalizes and interiorizes his father's precepts and follows them with joy, love and freedom. "Once you were ignorant of God, and enslaved to 'gods' who are not really gods at all"(Gal 4:5). In other words, people who were living in fear and bondage under the despotic control of 'gods' or various other forces, will experience great interior freedom if they come to know that through Jesus they have become truly God's children.

And this doctrine is further elucidated by St. John. After saying that every sinner is a slave, Christ says: "Now the slave's place in the house is not assured, but the son's place is" (Jn 8:39). Lyonsnet explains:

To sin and Satan, then John opposes love, which defines God(1 Jn 4:8); to the sinner who does the deeds of the devil, he opposes the child of God who does the works of God, with one commandment only: to
love as Christ has loved us (Jn 13:34; 1 Jn 2:7-8; 3:23), or, better still, to love by participating in the very love with which God loves us (Jn 17:26). The greatness and the tragedy of man's destiny lies in his having to choose between love and hate, between light and darkness, between him who is true and the evil one (1 Jn 5:19). Man will eternally be child of God or child of the devil.

Sin is thus a bondage. It is a choice between the true God who alone can fulfill man's destiny and between realities, which one may call Satan, some internal power, or some external blinding objects, which exert a despotic control over man, struggling to suppress man's natural dynamism towards his ultimate good, ultimate goal. When man chooses God wholeheartedly in filial love and submission, he will experience true freedom of God's children by sharing God's own life and love, progressively moving towards the total 'possession' of God. So the bondage does not consist in man's inability to choose between various goals or objects but in his inability to choose wholeheartedly his real and ultimate good that is God himself. In this sense the Hebrew word hata which is translated into Greek by hamartia and into English by sin, keeps up its etymological sense of missing the target or goal.

5. The Universality of the Human Bondage

Though the universality of the human bondage is a general Biblical doctrine it is highlighted chiefly by St. Paul. After vividly describing the sinful situation of man in his epistle to the Romans from the first to the fourth, he says in the fifth:

Well then, sin (he hamartia) entered the world through one man, and through sin death, and thus death has spread through the
whole of human race because everyone has sinned. Sin existed long before the Law was given. There was no law and so no one could be accused of the sin of 'law-breaking', yet death reigned over all from Adam to Moses, even though their sin, unlike that of Adam, was not a matter of breaking the law. Adam prefigured the One to come, but the gift itself outweighed the fall. If it is certain that through one man's fall so many died, it is even more certain that divine grace, coming through the one man, Jesus Christ, came to so many as an abundant free gift (Rom 5: 12-15).

This Pauline passage takes us to the Genesis story about the fall of the first man, Adam. Before trying to understand Paul's comparison of Adam with Christ, whom he calls the second Adam, a word on the nature of this story or myth is in order. The Genesis story or myth about the creation of man and his fall is not at all taken as a historical account but as historical etiology. Mythical stories which try to explain a present phenomenon (for instance the experience of man's universal bondage) in terms of some supposedly past happenings, often taken from the age-old traditions of the milieu are known as historical etiology. In the ancient Middle East there existed various stories about the creation of the world, of man and of his fall. But the Biblical authors try to impart their particular revelation through the media of these stories.

In this account God curses Adam and Eve (Gen 3:16-19). From the reference to the serpent's offspring and that of the woman, one could conclude from this narration itself that Adam's sin had the character of transmitting its evil effects from one generation to another. According to this author death is a consequence of man's sin.
you are and to dust you shall return" (Gen 3:19). From the universality of death the author of this account must have concluded to the universal effect of Adam's first sin, though he does not say explicitly. In the later chapters till the narration of the flood in chapter seven there are descriptions of numerous kinds of sins. The author anthropomorphically explains the universality of sin thus: "Yahweh saw that the wickedness of man was great on earth, and that the thoughts in his heart fashioned nothing but wickedness all day long. Yahweh regretted having made man on the earth, and his heart grieved." (Gen 6: 5-6). Though it is in Genesis a detailed description of the fall of the first man is given there are allusions and indirect references to it in other books too (Cfr. Ezek 28:12-15; Sir 25:24; Wis 2:22-24). About the universal sinfulness Isaiah writes: "We were all like men unclean, all that integrity of ours like filthy clothing." (Is 64:5-6).

The Pauline text which we have cited above is the chief one on which the doctrine of the Universality of human bondage which is known as Original Sin in Christian tradition, is based. Even here the primary stress is on Christ's universally liberating grace. According to St. Paul all are under the power of Sin, "Jews and Greeks are all under sin's dominion" (Rom 3:9). He emphasizes this idea by citing Psalm 14: "There is not a good man left, no, not one: there is not one who understands, not one who looks for God. All have turned aside, tainted all alike; there is not one good man left, not a single one." (Rom 3:11-12). After this Paul explains how man is saved not by keeping the laws slavishly but by faith-commitment to God who offers his help through
Jesus Christ out of his own initiative and liberality without man meriting it by keeping the legal prescriptions of Judaism. Then Paul in chapter 5 introduces Sin as a personified female power who had her sway over the whole of humanity from the time of the first sin.

"The image is that of the villain of the drama appearing on the stage with this frightful difference that the stage is the world, the play is our life and we are all deeply involved; all men are under this ghastly influence("all men" is repeated four times in vv 12-19 and "many" in the sense of "the multitude" four times more)". This parallelism between Adam the originator of sin and death, and Christ the originator of righteousness and life(resurrection) is found in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians also. He writes: "Death came through one man and in the same way the resurrection of the dead has come through one man. Just as all men die in Adam, so all men will be brought to life in Christ."(15:21-22).

St. Paul's teachings about the universal bondage of sin is based on his deep insight into man's inner struggle, which he vividly describes in Rom 7:

I have been sold as a slave to sin. I cannot understand my own behaviour: I fail to carry out the things I want to do, and I find myself doing the very things I hate.... The fact is, I know of nothing good living in me - living, that is, in my unspiritual self - for though the will to do what is good in me, the performance is not, with the result that instead of going the good things I want to do, I carry out the sinful things I do not want. When I act against my will, then, it is not my true self doing it, but sin(hamartia) which lives in me(15,18-20).

There are many opinions with regard to this passage, whether it is autobiographical or referring to humanity as a whole, and if to
humanity as a whole; in what sense, and so on. Here Paul refers to humanity as a whole left to itself without the liberating influence of God through Christ. After the description of this inner conflict and bondage he bursts into a cry of helplessness: "Who will rescue me from this body doomed to death? Thanks be to God through Jesus Christ our Lord!" (Rom 7:24). Paul's cry is not one of despair. For, though he knows that no man can liberate himself by his own power, he is fully aware of the ever-present grace of God through Christ the liberator.

E: MAN AND FREE WILL

The insistence of man's bondage and God's sovereign will gives us the impression that the Biblical writings do not take seriously man's free will, man's freedom to decide between various alternatives. One would feel that it is the Lord himself who hardens the hearts of the people lest they would listen to the slavific message (Is 6:9 ff).

In Paul often one would get the impression that God manipulates human decisions in such a way that always his will would prevail (Rom 8:28 ff; 9:10-21; 11:33-36). But as a matter of fact, freedom of will is taken for granted in the Bible as a whole and in the NT in particular. True, the Biblical authors as other ancient writers and unlike the modern man of science, attributed many of the happenings like victories and defeats, diseases and pestilences, and so on to God rather than to the secondary causes. Besides the NT authors like Paul, dazzled by the "overpowering power of God's grace" in Jesus Christ tended to highlight this aspect while downplaying man's free will.

We read in the book of Ben Siraeh:
Do not say, 'The Lord was responsible for my sinning', for he is never the cause of what he hates. Do not say 'It was he who led me astray', for he has no use for a sinner. The Lord hates all that is foul, and no one who fears him will love it either. He himself made man in the beginning, and then left him free to make his own decisions. If you wish, you can keep the commandments, to behave faithfully is within your power. He has set fire and water before you; put out your hand to whichever you prefer (15:11-17).

Those statements against the fatalists reflect very much the overall thinking in the Bible with regard to human freedom and responsibility. In the context of the second sin, namely the murder of Abel by Cain Yahweh asks Cain: 'Why are you angry and downcast?... But if you are ill disposed, is not sin at the door like a crouching beast hungering for you, which you must master?' (Gen 4:7-8). Indeed, Adam was keen to resist the allurements of the serpent.

In the NT the parable of the Prodigal Son (L: 15:11-32) which we have referred to earlier, graphically points out this idea. Though the father is affectionate he does not resist his son to leave his house. At last the son feels that he should return to his father. And then he comes back the father receives him warmly. The father loves his son dearly, but his love is such that it respects the individuality of his son and his freedom. Another image that describes the relationship between God and man in the NT is of the master-servant relationship. Christ says: 'No one can be the slave of two masters: he will either hate the first and love the second or treat the first with respect and the second with scorn. You cannot be the slave both of God and of money.' (Mt. 6:24).
True, Paul in Rom 7, emphasizes the difficulty of choosing the good instead of evil. But his intention is to highlight the overpowering, liberating grace of Jesus Christ. In fact, in the same letter he had already made clear his view about human freedom. In the matter of following one's conscience Paul says: "They can point to the substance of the law engraved on their hearts - they can call a witness, that is their own conscience - they have accusation and defence, that is their own inner mental dialogue." (Rom. 2:15)

Here, Paul alludes to the process of decision-making through inner dialogue. Elsewhere Paul speaks of trying to master his enslaving passions by self-discipline. He says: "I treat my body hard and make it obey me, for, having been an announcer myself, I should not want to be disqualified." (1 Cor 9:27). True, the way of righteousness is a narrow and difficult way while that of evil is easy and pleasant. But Christ says: "Enter by the narrow gate, since the road that leads to perdition is wide and spacious, and many take it; but it is a narrow gate and a hard road that leads to life, and only a few find it" (Mt 7:13-14).

It is not easy to understand how God's sovereignty will achieve what it designs for man and his affairs while at the same time respecting man's freedom, or the overpowering grace which seems to make man's resistance futile. The NT writers do not posit this as a problem though they uphold both of the aspects of the problem. rightly \( \text{LD} \) remarks:

The sacred writers have not resolved the apparent antinomy between God's sovereignty and man's freedom, but they have said enough
about it in affirming that both elements are necessary for salvation. Paul sees this truth as applying to his own life (Acts 22:6-10; 1 Cor 15:10) and to that of every Christian (Phil 2:12 ff). The mystery remains; but God knows how to move our hearts without violence and how to draw us to himself without constraint (Ps 119:36; Ex 36:26 ff; Ho 2:16 ff; Jn 6:44).

CONCLUSION:

We started the chapter with a static consideration of the ontological constitution of man. In spite of the fallacy implied in viewing as static something which is essentially dynamic, such a view too is of some value to us to understand the concept of the Theanthropos in the NT. We found that the Biblical concept of the human structure and personality are quite different from that of the Indian and Western, chiefly due to the unitary or totality-view of the human reality in the former. However, we pointed out that there is also an elementary sort of dualism.

The second part was meant just to highlight the importance of the concept of man's creaturiness or total dependence on God in the NT. Since much of the details of this question were implied in the treatment of God as a creator, our consideration was sketchy and factual. Then we get into the topic of the concept of man being the image of God. Man's dominion over other creatures and his filial relationship are two of the main reasons that led the Biblical authors to call man by this symbol. According to the NT it is through Jesus Christ, who is the perfect image of God, man has to restore his image distorted through transmitted and actual sins. Indeed, the task to any follower of Christ is to remould his image after the manner of Jesus Christ.
We got into the question of man's bondage after making some provisional remarks about the basic NT teaching that God's liberating influence through Christ was present whenever man found himself in bondage. According to the NT this bondage is universal, extending to all men of all times as in the case of the liberating grace. In the final part it has become clear to us that though according to the NT God always achieves his designs in spite of man, he never goes against human freedom. One important point which we have left for later consideration is man's social nature. In fact, the man of the NT cannot be fully understood unless this aspect is taken seriously. However, it will be considered when the question of Christ's salvific import will be treated.